			537721 Apr 04	RNA
1	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF	Comment Supercount	Legal S.A.	- I - 5
2	JOHN R. HENDRIX	8		mar an apart well
3	ON BEHALF OF		27.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2.50 2	
4	SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY		.E	
5	<b>DOCKET NO. 2004-002-E</b>	25 8		Ĥ
6		Ö	8	No., part
7	Q. Do you have comments regarding the adjustment in Ms. Ch	nerry's		
8	Testimony on page 3, line 20 in the amount of \$5,432,913?			
9	A. Yes. This is an adjustment Ms. Cherry proposed in Docket No. 2003-2-E.			
10	The adjustment consisted of the disallowance of certain purchased power costs.			
11	The Company disagreed with these disallowances, and the Commission did not			
12	rule on them in its Order No. 2003-295 stating that it would wait for guidance			
13	from the courts. As I have previously stated in my testimony, the court has			
14	remanded the purchase power issue back to the Commission having ruled in			
15	favor of the argument made by the Consumer Advocate. The Company and the			
16	Consumer Advocate have entered into a settlement that, if approve	d by the		
17	Commission, would settle the issues in Docket Nos. 2002-2-E and 2003-2-E and			
18	render Ms. Cherry's adjustment unnecessary.			
19	Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?	•		
20	A. Yes			

HETURN DATE: OK RNG SERVICE: OK RNG SERVICE: \_\_\_